

# Hardness of approximating the weight enumerator of a binary linear code

M. N. Vyalyi\*

Institute for Quantum Information

California Institute of Technology

vyalyi@mccme.ru

February 1, 2008

## Abstract

We consider the problem of evaluation of the weight enumerator of a binary linear code. We show that the exact evaluation is hard for polynomial hierarchy. More exactly, if  $WE$  is an oracle answering the solution of the evaluation problem then  $P^{WE} = P^{GapP}$ . Also we consider the approximative evaluation of the weight enumerator. In the case of approximation with additive accuracy  $2^{-\alpha n}$ ,  $\alpha$  is constant the problem is hard in the above sense. We also prove that approximate evaluation at a single point  $e^{\pi i/4}$  is hard for  $0 < \alpha < \log_2 |1 + \omega| \approx 0.88$ .

The weight enumerator of a linear binary code  $C$  can be defined as follows

$$w_C(q) = \sum_{x \in C} q^{|x|}. \quad (1)$$

Here  $|x|$  is a Hamming weight of binary string  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . According to the definition, the weight enumerator is a polynomial in  $q$  with integer coefficients. The exact calculation of any coefficient of the weight enumerator is a  $\#P$ -problem. Evaluation of the weight enumerator at any positive integer point is a  $\#P$ -problem too. As for evaluation at arbitrary point the approximate setting seems more appropriate. Using approximate evaluation with additive accuracy of  $2^{-\text{poly}(n)}$  at different points it is possible to compute all (integer) coefficients of the weight enumerator. The vector of coefficients is expressed as a linear transform of the vector of values in any set of  $n + 1$  point. A matrix of this transform is inverse of the Vandermonde matrix. The accuracy of  $2^{-\text{poly}(n)}$  for values of a polynomial degree  $n$  is sufficient to get the coefficients of the polynomial with  $1/2$ -accuracy.

To avoid the difficulties that arise when dealing with arbitrary real (and complex) numbers we will substitute the problem of the high-accuracy evaluation of the weight enumerator at arbitrary point by the problem of computation the coefficients of the weight enumerator.

**WEIGHT ENUMERATOR PROBLEM.** Given a binary linear code  $C$  find out the coefficients of the weight enumerator  $w_C(\omega)$ .

We denote an oracle answering the weight enumerator problem by  $WE$ .

Given coefficients of the weight enumerator of a code it is easy to find out the minimal distance of the code. The latter problem is NP-complete [8]. Moreover, it is hard to approximate the minimal distance [1]. So, the evaluation of the weight enumerator is NP-hard. Here we give more exact characterization for the complexity of this problem. We show that an oracle answering a solution for the evaluation of the weight enumerator problem can simulate any oracle in the class GapP [2]. The class GapP is closure of  $\#P$  under subtraction. The formal definition of the GapP uses the notion of counting machine. A *counting machine* is

---

\*Partially supported by RFBR grant 02-01-00547

a non-deterministic Turing machine running in polynomial time and finishing at either accepting or rejecting halting state. Given an input word  $x$  a counting machine produces a gap  $g_M(x)$ . *The gap* is the difference between the number of accepting computation paths and the number of rejecting computation paths. The inclusion  $\#P \subseteq \text{GapP}$  and Toda's theorem  $\text{PH} \subseteq \text{P}^{\#P}$  imply that  $\text{P}^{\text{GapP}}$  is hard for the polynomial hierarchy.

**Theorem 1.**  $\text{P}^{WE} = \text{P}^{\text{GapP}}$ .

In our reduction we use the techniques of quantum computations. It was proved by Fenner, Green, Homer and Pruim [3] that determining acceptance possibility for a quantum computation is hard for the polynomial hierarchy. Here we take the similar approach considering the problem of very tight approximation of a matrix element  $\langle 0|U|0\rangle$  for a quantum circuit realizing an unitary operator  $U$ .

It will be shown below that quantum circuits can compute the approximation of weight enumerator for some codes with an additive accuracy  $2^{\alpha n}$ , where  $\alpha$  is constant. So, it is interesting to characterize the complexity of approximate evaluation of the weight enumerator with an additive accuracy of  $2^{\alpha n}$ . We consider two problems related to this question.

**ESTIMATION AT AN ARBITRARY POINT.** The input of this problem is  $(C, q)$ , where  $C$  is an  $[n, d]$  binary linear code and  $q$  is a complex number  $e^{i\pi\varphi}$  with  $\varphi$  be a rational number. The output  $\tilde{w}$  must satisfy the condition

$$|\tilde{w} - w_c(q)| < 2^{\alpha n}. \quad (2)$$

**ESTIMATION AT THE POINT  $\omega$ .** The input of this problem is  $(C, q)$ , where  $C$  is an  $[n, d]$  binary linear code and  $\omega = e^{i\pi/4}$ . The output  $\tilde{w}$  must satisfy the condition

$$|\tilde{w} - w_c(\omega)| < 2^{\alpha n}. \quad (3)$$

We denote the oracles answering these problems by  $\text{WE}(\alpha)$  and  $\text{WE}_\omega(\alpha)$  respectively.

We will prove that the  $WE$  is Turing reducible to both  $\text{WE}(\alpha)$  and  $\text{WE}_\omega(\alpha)$ . In the latter case we need an additional restriction to the constant  $\alpha$ :  $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0 = \log_2 |1 + \omega| \approx 0.88$ .

**Corollary 1.**  $\text{P}^{\text{WE}(\alpha)} = \text{P}^{\text{GapP}}$  for any  $0 < \alpha < 1$ .

**Corollary 2.**  $\text{P}^{\text{WE}_\omega(\alpha)} = \text{P}^{\text{GapP}}$  for  $0 < \alpha < \alpha_0$ .

These corollaries show that the approximation with exponentially small accuracy of the weight function of general linear code by quantum computations is hardly possible.

For basic facts about quantum computation we refer to the book of Nielsen and Chuang [6]. We will need a very little of coding theory. The basic definitions can be found in the classical book of MacWilliams and Sloane [7]. For details of gap-defined classes see the paper [2].

## 1 Matrix element problem and proof of Theorem 1

We choose the basis  $B = \{\text{CNOT}, H, T\}$  for quantum circuits, where

$$\text{CNOT}: |a, b\rangle \mapsto |a, a \oplus b\rangle; \quad H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}; \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

It is well-known that this basis provides universal quantum computation. Solovay–Kitaev theorem guarantees the fast and effective approximation of any unitary operator by the operators in this basis.

**MATRIX ELEMENT PROBLEM.** Given a description of a quantum circuit in the basis  $B$  and accuracy threshold  $\varepsilon$  find out the approximation  $\tilde{u}$  of a matrix element  $\langle 0|U|0\rangle$  with accuracy  $\varepsilon$ :  $|\tilde{u} - \langle 0|U|0\rangle| < \varepsilon$ . Here  $U$  stands for an operator realizing by the circuit.

Let's denote an oracle answering the matrix element problem by  $ME$ .

**Theorem 2.**  $\text{P}^{ME} = \text{P}^{\text{GapP}}$ .

To prove Theorems 1 and 2 we construct three Turing reductions: a  $\text{GapP}$  oracle to the oracle  $ME$  oracle; then the  $ME$  oracle to the  $WE$  oracle; then the  $WE$  oracle to a  $\text{GapP}$  oracle.

## 1.1 Reduction an GapP-oracle to the $ME$ oracle

Let  $f$  be a GapP-function. We assume that  $f$  is computed by a counting machine in the normal form and the machine makes only nondeterministic moves with branching degree 2. Lemma 4.3 from [2] guarantees that we do not loss the generality: the gaps computing by machines in normal form and general ones differ by factor 2.

Reduction of  $f$ -oracle to the  $ME$  oracle reproduce the argument used in [9]. Let  $q$  be the number of nondeterministic moves along a computation path. The number does not depend on a choice of computation path due to the normal form condition. So, we may consider counting machine described above as a deterministic Turing machine  $M$  supplied with an additional input: a *guess string*  $r \in \{0, 1\}^q$ . Bits of the guess string determine the choices for the nondeterministic moves. This machine produces the same gap  $g_M(x)$  as the initial one.

Now we transform the machine  $M$  to a Boolean circuit  $C_M$  in the basis  $\{\oplus, \wedge\}$  computing 1 for pairs (input, guess) finishing at the rejecting state and computing 0 for pairs (input, guess) finishing at the accepting state. The size of the circuit  $C_M$  is quadratic on running time of the  $M$ . For fixed input string  $x$  the gap produced by  $M$  is the difference between the number of guess strings  $u$  that give the circuit output 0 and the number of guess strings  $u$  that give the circuit output 1.

Hereinafter we will simplify notation and will use  $+$  and  $\cdot$  instead of  $\oplus$  and  $\wedge$  respectively.

Let  $s$  be the size of the circuit  $C_M$ . By  $z_k^{(j)}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq s$ , we denote auxiliary variables of the  $C_M$ . We also assume that the circuit output is given by the value of the variable  $z_s^{(j)}$ . Each assignment in a circuit has the form  $z_k^{(j)} := a * b$  where  $*$   $\in \{+, \cdot\}$  and  $a, b$  are either input or auxiliary variables. This assignment corresponds the equation  $Z_k^{(j)} = z_k^{(j)} + a * b = 0$ . Note that the values of input variables and the guess string  $(x, u)$  determine the values of all auxiliary variables. So, for each  $x$  fixed the number of solutions of the system of equations  $Z_k^{(j)} = 0$ ,  $1 \leq k < s$ ,  $z_s^{(j)} = \zeta$  equals the number of rejecting computation paths of the counting machine  $M$  for  $\zeta = 1$  and the number of accepting paths for  $\zeta = 0$ .

For a polynomial  $p$  over the two-element field  $\mathbb{F}_2$  we denote by  $\Delta p$  the number

$$\Delta p = \sum_x (-1)^{p(x)}. \quad (5)$$

Now let's introduce polynomials over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ :

$$F_x^\zeta(u, z, v) = \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} v_k Z_k^{(j)} + v_0(z_s^{(j)} + \zeta), \quad F_x = (1 + w)F_x^{(0)} + w(1 + F_x^{(1)}), \quad (6)$$

$$\zeta \in \{0, 1\}, v \in \{0, 1\}^s, w \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Let us check that

$$\Delta F_x(u, z, v, w) = \Delta F_x^0(u, z, v) - \Delta F_x^1(u, z, v) = 2^s g_m(x). \quad (7)$$

The polynomials  $F_x^\zeta$  are linear in variables  $v_j$ . So, if values  $x, u, z$  does not satisfy a system  $Z_k^{(j)} = 0$ ,  $1 \leq k < s$ ,  $z_s^{(j)} = \zeta$  then all possible assignments to variables  $v$  contribute the zero term to the sum (5) for the polynomial  $F_x^\zeta$ . If values  $x, u, z$  satisfy the system then  $F_x^\zeta = 0$  for any assignment of  $v$ . Thus any accepting computation path of  $M$  contributes  $2^s$  to  $\Delta F_x^0(u, z, v)$  and any rejecting path contributes  $2^s$  to  $\Delta F_x^1(u, z, v)$ . The first equation in (7) follows immediately from the definition (5).

From the construction described above it is clear that function  $x \mapsto F_x$  is computable in polynomial time.

Now we relate the value  $\Delta F_x$  to a value  $\langle 0|U(F_x)|0\rangle$  for some unitary operator acting in the space  $\mathcal{B}^{\otimes N}$  of  $N$  qubits where  $N$  is the total number of variables in the polynomial  $F_x$ .

The operator  $S_J = \Lambda^J(-1)$  (controlled phase shift) corresponds to the monomial  $x_J = \prod_{j \in J} x_j$  of  $F_x$ . Controlled phase shift is defined as

$$\begin{cases} \Lambda^J(-1)|x_1 \dots x_n\rangle = -|x_1 \dots x_n\rangle, & x_J = 1, \\ \Lambda^J(-1)|x_1 \dots x_n\rangle = |x_1 \dots x_n\rangle, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Let

$$U(F_x) = \prod_{j=1}^n H[j] \prod_{J \in M(F_x)} S_J \prod_{j=1}^n H[j] \quad (9)$$

where  $M(F_x)$  is the set of the monomials of  $F_x$ .

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0|U(F_x)|0\rangle &= \\ &= \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_N} \langle u_1, \dots, u_N | \prod_{J \in M(f)} S_J | u_1, \dots, u_N \rangle = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_N} (-1)^{\sum_{J \in M(f)} u_J} = \\ &= \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{u_1, \dots, u_N} (-1)^{F_x(u)} = 2^{-N} \Delta F_x. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Now, we approximate each factor in (9)  $U(f)$  with accuracy  $\delta = 2^{-N-2}/M$  by a quantum circuit in the basis  $B$ . Here  $M = \text{poly}(n)$  denotes the number of factors in (9). A matrix element  $\langle 0|\tilde{U}|0\rangle$  of a product  $\tilde{U}$  of these approximations is very close to  $\langle 0|U(F_x)|0\rangle$ :

$$|\langle 0|\tilde{U} - U(F_x)|0\rangle| < 2^{-N-2}. \quad (11)$$

So, we may compute the exact value of  $\Delta F_x$  if an approximate evaluation of  $\langle 0|\tilde{U}|0\rangle$  with accuracy  $2^{-N-2}$  is given.

To complete the proof of this reduction we note that each factor in (9) acts on 4 bits at most. So, by the Solovay – Kitaev theorem [4, 6] the required efficient approximation  $\tilde{U}$  can be constructed in  $\text{poly}(n)$  time.

## 1.2 Reduction the *ME* oracle to the *WE* oracle

Consider a quantum circuit in the basis  $B$  that realize an operator  $U$ . All computational paths of this circuit have the same scale factor  $1/2^{N/2}$  where  $N$  is the total number of Hadamard gates in the circuit. So, to compute the value  $\langle 0|U|0\rangle$  we need to sum up phases along all computational paths that start at  $|0\rangle$  and finish at  $|0\rangle$ . Note that an Hadamard gate that applies last to the particular qubit doesn't affect the number of  $|0\rangle$  to  $|0\rangle$  paths. Let  $d$  be the number of other Hadamard gates. Then there are  $2^d$  summands in the expression of  $\langle 0|U|0\rangle$ . Each summand is indexed by a binary vector  $u \in \mathbb{F}_2^d$  consisted of qubit values just after application of the corresponding Hadamard gate.

A phase shift along a computational path consists of two factors. The first describes the action of  $T$  operators. It has a form

$$\prod_{k=1}^t \omega^{\ell_k(u)}, \quad \text{where } \omega = e^{i\pi/4},$$

and  $\ell_k(u)$  is a  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -linear form. The second factor describes phase shifts induced by Hadamard gates. It has a form

$$(-1)^{B(u)}, \quad \text{where } B(u) = \sum_{j=1}^d b_j(u) u_j.$$

$\mathbb{F}_2$ -linear form  $b_j$  in this expression is the value of a qubit just before application of  $j$ th Hadamard gate. Using equations  $i^{a \oplus b} = i^a i^b (-1)^{ab}$  and  $i = \omega^2$  the second factor can be rewritten in the form similar to the first factor.

Finally, we get the following expression of the matrix element  $\langle 0|U|0\rangle$ :

$$\langle 0|U|0\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} \sum_{u \in \mathbb{F}_2^d} \prod_{k=1}^n \omega^{\beta_k(u)}, \quad (12)$$

where  $\beta_k$  are  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -linear forms.

It is clear that up to the factor  $1/2^{N/2}$  this expression equals  $w_C(\omega)$ —the value of weight enumerator at the point  $\omega$  for some binary linear code  $C$ . Coefficients of linear forms  $\beta_k(u)$  are columns of the generator matrix for this code  $C$ .

So, we reduce the matrix element problem to the weight enumerator evaluation problem.

### 1.3 Reduction the $WE$ oracle to a GapP oracle

Let  $C$  be a linear binary code. It is a  $d$ -dimensional subspace of an  $n$ -dimensional space  $\mathbb{F}_2^n$ . By usual properties of GapP functions [2] the function  $E(D(C), q) = w_C(q) \in \text{GapP}$ , where  $D(C)$  is a description of the code  $C$  and  $q$  is integer. The required reduction follows from the fact that all coefficients of  $w_C(q)$  can be restored efficiently from the value  $E(D(C), 2^n)$ .

## 2 An approximate evaluation

Theorem 1 establishes the hardness of high-accuracy approximation of the weight enumerator.

Now we will prove two results concerning the approximation with moderate accuracy. Our choice of accuracy bounds is motivated by observation of Knill and Laflamme [5] that the power of quantum computation is just the ability to produce a Bernoulli sequences with a parameter  $p$  given by a real or imaginary part of a matrix element  $\langle 0|U|0 \rangle$  of an operator realized by a quantum circuit. So, value of the matrix element can be estimated with an accuracy  $n^{-O(1)}$  and exponentially small error probability.

The formula (12) shows that the value of weight enumerator  $w_C(\omega)$  can be evaluated in some cases with rather high accuracy  $n^{-O(1)}2^{N/2}$ . Interesting quantum computation that does not reduced directly to the probabilistic one corresponds the case  $N < 2d/\log d$ .

Corollaries 1 and 2 show that the general case differs from the case of these special codes. In this section we give the proofs of these corollaries.

### 2.1 Combining codes: direct sums and wreath sums

In this section we introduce two operations with linear codes and describe corresponding transformations of weight enumerators.

Consider an  $[n_1, d_1]$  linear code  $A$  and an  $[n_2, d_2]$  linear code  $B$ . Let  $G_A$  and  $G_B$  are the generator matrices of codes  $A$  and  $B$  respectively.

A direct sum  $A \oplus B$  is a  $[n_1 + n_2, d_1 + d_2]$  code defined by generator matrix as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_A & 0 \\ 0 & G_B \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

The weight enumerator of the direct sum is just the product of weight enumerators of summands:

$$w_{A \oplus B}(q) = w_A(q)w_B(q). \quad (14)$$

A wreath sum  $A \wr B$  is a  $[n_1 n_2, d_1 + d_2]$  code. To define elements of the generator matrix  $G_{A \wr B}$  for  $A \wr B$  we assume that rows of  $G_{A \wr B}$  are indexed by pairs  $(k_1, 0)$ ,  $1 \leq k_1 \leq d_1$ , and  $(0, k_2)$ ,  $1 \leq k_2 \leq d_2$ , and columns are indexed by pairs  $(l_1, l_2)$ ,  $1 \leq l_1 \leq n_1$ ,  $1 \leq l_2 \leq n_2$ . In this setting the elements of  $G_{A \wr B}$  are given by

$$(G_{A \wr B})_{(k,0)(l_1,l_2)} = (G_A)_{k_1 l_1} \quad (15)$$

$$(G_{A \wr B})_{(0,k)(l_1,l_2)} = (G_B)_{k_2 l_2}. \quad (16)$$

Each pair of words  $(a, b)$ ,  $a \in A, b \in B$  determines in natural way a word  $c_{ab} \in A \wr B$ . Each bit  $\alpha$  in the codeword  $a$  is extended to a string  $\alpha^{l_2}$ . This string is added by the codeword  $b$  to produce the  $l_2$ -block of the codeword  $c_{a,b}$ . So, for weights of these codewords the following relation holds

$$|c_{ab}| = |a|(n_2 - |b|) + |b|(n_1 - |a|).$$

From this equation we get the following relation between weight enumerators:

$$w_{A \wr B}(q) = \sum_{a \in A} q^{n_2|a|} w_B(1 + q^{n_1-2|a|}). \quad (17)$$

## 2.2 Proof of Corollary 1

We will construct a Turing reduction of the weight enumerator evaluation problem to the  $\text{WE}(\alpha)$  problem.

Namely, we will evaluate weight enumerators of a code  $C_k = C \oplus I_k$  at several point  $q_j$ . Here  $I_k$  means the trivial code given by identity generator matrix. The parameter  $k$  will be chosen later.

Choose  $r$  such that  $\beta = 2^\alpha/(2-r) < 1$ . Note that  $(2^{\alpha(d+k)})$ -evaluation of  $w_{C_k}$  implies much stronger estimation of  $w_C$ : if  $|q-1| < r$  and  $|w_{C_k}(q) - \tilde{w}(q)| < 2^{\alpha(d+k)}$  then

$$\left| \frac{w_C(q)(1+q)^k - \tilde{w}}{(1+q)^k} \right| = \left| w_C(q) - \frac{\tilde{w}}{(1+q)^k} \right| < 2^{\alpha d} \beta^k = 2^{-\Omega(k)}. \quad (18)$$

(In asymptotic notations we assume that  $k \rightarrow \infty$  while other parameters are fixed.)

To compute the coefficients of weight enumerator  $w_C(q)$  we use this tight bound for  $n+1$  points inside the circle  $|z-1| < r$ . The distances between these points can be chosen greater than  $r/(2(n+1))$ . So, the inverse of Vandermonde determinant for these points is  $2^{O(n^2 \log n)}$ .

Thus, for some  $k = \text{poly}(n, d)$  we can compute the coefficients of the weight enumerator with accuracy  $1/2$ .

## 2.3 Proof of Corollary 2

Note that reduction in the subsection 1.2 uses the evaluation of the weight enumerator at the point  $\omega$  only.

To construct a Turing reduction of the weight enumerator evaluation problem to  $\text{WE}_\omega(\alpha)$  problem we will obtain an evaluation of the weight enumerator of a code  $C$  at point  $\omega$  using the  $(2^{\alpha(n+a+k)})$ -estimations of weight enumerators for codes  $C(a, k) = C_a \wr I_k$  at the same point. Here  $I_k$  stands for a trivial code of dimension  $k$  and code  $C_a$  is produced from the code  $C$  by padding  $a$  zeroes to each codeword. From (17) we get for these codes:

$$w_{C(a, k)} = \sum_{w \in C} \omega^{k|w|} (1 + \omega^{n+a-2|w|})^k. \quad (19)$$

We assume that  $k \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ .

Divide the weight enumerator sum for code  $C$  in four parts:

$$w_C(\omega) = M_0 + M_1 + M_2 + M_3; \quad M_j = \sum_{w \in C, |w| \equiv j \pmod{4}} \omega^j. \quad (20)$$

It is clear that  $|M_j| < 2^n$ .

Now rewrite (19) as

$$w_{C(a, k)} = M_0(1 + \omega^{n+a})^k + M_1(1 - i\omega^{n+a})^k + M_2(1 - \omega^{n+a})^k + M_3(1 + i\omega^{n+a})^k \quad (21)$$

Take  $a$  such that  $n+a \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ . Let  $\tilde{w}_1$  be an  $(2^{\alpha(n+a+k)})$ -evaluation of the  $w_{C(a, k)}$  and  $N = |1 + \omega|$ . From (21) we have

$$|M_0 + M_1\omega^{-1} + M_2\frac{(1-\omega)^k}{N^k} + M_3\frac{(1-\omega^{-1})^k}{N^k} - \frac{\tilde{w}_1}{N^k}| < 2^{\alpha(n+a+k)}/N^k = 2^{\alpha(n+a)} \left(\frac{2^\alpha}{N}\right)^k. \quad (22)$$

The last factor is  $2^{-\Omega(k)}$ . Note that

$$\frac{(1-\omega)^k}{N^k} = 2^{-\Omega(k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(1-\omega^{-1})^k}{N^k} = 2^{-\Omega(k)}.$$

So, for some  $k = \text{poly}(n, -\log \varepsilon)$  we obtain an  $\varepsilon$ -evaluation  $\mu_0$  of  $M_0 + M_1\omega^{-1}$ .

Incrementing  $a$  by 2 in the above argument we get  $\varepsilon$ -evaluations  $\mu_j$  of  $M_j + M_{j+1}\omega^{-1}$ . Solving the linear system

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 + x_1\omega^{-1} &= \mu_0, \\ x_1 + x_2\omega^{-1} &= \mu_1, \\ x_2 + x_3\omega^{-1} &= \mu_2, \\ x_3 + x_0\omega^{-1} &= \mu_3, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

we get the  $O(\varepsilon)$ -approximations for  $M_j$ . It is enough to solve the weight enumerator evaluation problem for code  $C$ .

## References

- [1] I. Dumer, D. Micciancio, M. Sudan. Hardness of Approximating the Minimum Distance of a Linear Code. FOCS, 1999. P. 475-485.
- [2] S. Fenner, L. Fortnow, S. Kurtz. Gap-definable counting classes. J. of Comp. and Sys. Sci. 1994. V. 48. P. 116–148.
- [3] S. Fenner, F. Green, S. Homer and R. Pruim. Determining acceptance possibility for a quantum computation is hard for the polynomial hierarchy. Proc. of the Royal Society London. Ser. A, 1999. Vol. 455. P. 3953–3966.
- [4] A. Kitaev, A. Shen, M. Vyalyi. Classical and Quantum Computation. AMS, 2002.
- [5] E. Knill, R. Laflamme On the Power of One Bit of Quantum Computation. quant-ph/9802037
- [6] M.A. Nielsen, I.I. Chuang. Quantum computation and quantum information. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.
- [7] F.J. MacWilliams, N.J.A. Sloane. The theory of Error-Correcting codes, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1981.
- [8] A. Vardy. Algorithmic complexity in coding theory and the minimum distance problem. STOC, 1997. P. 92-109.
- [9] M.N. Vyalyi. A comparison of Zeroes and Ones of a Boolean Polynomial. cs.CC/0111052